

THE REHEARSAL.

1. Mr. Review his Story of Taunton brought in.
2. His Luck at Stories.
3. His Arguing from a Particular to a General.
4. He Pursues that of the Play-House.
5. Easy to make Reprizals.
6. If the Story of Taunton were True, yet the Review still more Guilty.
7. Four Mistakes in his Story of Taunton.
8. His Reflections upon the Clergy and Church-Men there are False and Scandalous.

SATURDAY, July 6th 1706.

(1.) Country-man. **Y**OU have not in your Last, Master, Answer'd the most Material Argument which the Review of the 18th last June, Vol. 3. N. 73. brings to support his Likelies, who are most Likely to be Enemies to the Duke of Marlborough and the Government. And that is a long Story he tells (which takes almost his whole Review) of an Election for Church-Wardens at Taunton, and about Ringing their Bells, on the News of our late Victories.

(2.) Rehearsal. I lay little stress upon his Stories, he has had such ill Luck with them! Especially since his Weather-Cock! Not for his being Misinform'd, (for that may befall any Man, tho' he ought to take Care before he puts it in Print) but for his standing it out so Obstinately, after full Conviction, and Repeating it, over and over again, for about Half a Year together, when he had Nothing to say to support it; till I was forc'd at last Perfectly to Hew him down into Silence, but Could never bring him to a Confession or Owning of his Fault to this Day! After this, what shou'd I do to Chase his Stories?

(3.) And for another Reason. His Method is, from Particular Accusations, to Infer a General Conclusion. Thus he Picks up Stories of Particular Clergy-Men, whether True or False; And thence draws his Inference, and passes Sentence upon the whole Order, as the Dead-Weight against the Settlement of the Nation, and therefore fit to be Remov'd! One Third of them to be Hanged; and Parts of the Remaining 5 to be Treated as Enemies to the Government! He makes them a Proverbial Jest, and the most Abominable Wicked Crew that God ever Suffer'd to go unpunish'd, since the Destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah! All this I have Prov'd from his own Words, so Plainly and Demonstrably, that he can make no Reply, more than to the Weather-Cock! Yet, as in that Case, this stops not his Mouth, but he will still go on in his Persecuting the Clergy. He cannot Help it! Whether from his own Inclinations, or this Shamefull Drudgery being put upon him by those who Employ him, I will not Examine.

But still the Cry against the Clergy must be kept up! In this very Review, N. 73. p. 290. he is at it again, and notwithstanding of his having made no Reply, or Offer'd to Defend himself against these Charges made Good against him in the Rehearsal, he still Repeats his Accusation, and will not be Silenc'd, but says, No, No, Mr. REHEARSAL, there is in plain English an Unhappy Defection in the Inferior CLERGY, and too many are Debauch'd with HIGH-CHURCH and FRENCH Principles, which I take to be the same thing. Here is Destruction to them again! High-Church is French! And by High-Church (as I have before fully Prov'd, and he can make no Reply) the Body of the Clergy in General is meant! All are French! then Down with them!

And (as I said) all this Built upon some poor Story, not worth Examining, of this or that, Particular Person; And as True, I suppose, as his Weather-Cock! For as many of them as have been Examin'd have Prov'd so.

(4.) Thus his Story of the Play-House Contributing to the Repair of a Chappel, which he may fix, perhaps, upon some one unwary Church-Warden, is Improv'd by him to a violent Satyr against the whole Church, as I have shew'd in my two Last, upon his Num. 74. of the 20th. of June last. Yet he thought one whole Review spent upon this Subject not Enough, but gives us the Second Part to the same Tune, in his of the 25th, last June, N. 76. which is all Employ'd upon this Subject, and Begins thus, Upon the PLAT-HOUSE coming in by way of Collection for the Use of the CHURCH. And calls it, A Confederacy with HELL, to support her Dying HIGH-CHURCH Cause; He names High-Church, but means the Whole Church, as I have fully shew'd upon his Num. 74. in mine Num. 117.

Now after this, what wou'd you have me Chase any more of his Stories for? Which if True, signify nothing to Place a General Charge upon; only to Shew the Inveterat Malice of these Men, who can get no better Handle against the Church.

(5.) And if this Method were either Christian, or Becoming a Gentleman, or any Proof against a whole Body of Men, he knows I could make

make full *Reprizals* upon him from both *former* and *Later Examples*, and more *Publick* and *Notorious*, even in the *Streets*, than any he can Charge upon the *Church*. But I leave such *Arguments* to them who have no *Better* to make use of.

(6.) What wou'd it Signify, if he shou'd shew a *Rash* or *Undescreet Action* done by Somebody at *Taunton*? Wou'd this Determine who are most *Likely* to be *Enemies* to the *Duke of Marlborough* and the *Government*? Which is the *Point* for which he brings it as a *Proof*? Wou'd this be such a *Proof*, as a *Couple* of *Weekly Writers* *Implay'd* or *Encourag'd* to *Libel* the *D. of Marlborough* and the *Government*? And who have *Continu'd* in this *Employment* these *several Years*. As I have, from the *Beginning* of these *Rehearsals*, abundantly shewn. Is not this a fuller *Proof* of the *Design* of a *Party*, than what any 2 or 3 *Men* at *Taunton* shou'd *Accidentally* do or say about the *Ringing* of their *Bells*, or *Choosing Church-Wardens*? Did any of them say, that the *D. of Marlborough* was *Allegorical* in what he wrote to the *Secretary of State*? That is, did not *Mean* what he *Said*. Or that he was a *Fool*, if he thought of *Conquering France*? That he was *Fighting* against *Divine Right*? And that the *Queen* had no *Divine Right*? Did any of the *Men* at *Taunton* talk at this *Rate*? Yet all this the *Review* which *Accuses* them has said, and *Maintains* it, as I shew'd in my *Last*.

(7.) *Country-m.* Then, *Master*, you let the *Story* of *Taunton* go for *Truth*, as he tells it.

Rehears. No, *Country-Man*. Because he tells it, therefore I *Suspect* it. According to the *Rule* I formerly gave you of *Believing Stories* they tell for *Furthering* of their *Cause*. And because it was of no *Consequence*, if *True*, therefore I *Inquir'd* nothing about it.

Country-m. But it will be of some *Consequence*, if any thing of this *Story* so formally told, shou'd prove otherwise. It will be a *Confirmation*, *Master*, of that *Rule* you Gave me. And which I have not found to *Fail* hitherto.

Now here is a *Letter* I was desir'd to shew you. I suppose it comes from *Taunton*. And bears *Date* *June 22. 1706*. The *Name* I conceal, unless there be *Occasion* for it. But I know the *Person* to whom it was wrote. And it *Contradicts* almost the *Whole* of what the *Review* says upon this *Matter*. Let me Name a few *Particulars*.

1. The *Review* says, p. 290. That it is not the *Usage* and *Custom* at *Taunton* for the *Minister* of the *Parish* to have the *Naming* of One of the *Church-Wardens*, as is usual in other *Places*. On the *Contrary* the *Letter* says, it is allow'd to the *Minister* at *Taunton*, and has been *Exercis'd* by several *Ministers*, without any *Opposition*, except from the *Dissenters*.

2. The *Review* says, The *Office* (of *Church-Warden*) has been *diligently Engross'd* by the *PARTY* (as he *Lovingly* calls the *Church*!) for several *Years* past. The *Letter* says, That for above twenty *Years* past, the *DISSENTERS* have *Man'd* in this *Office* with the *CHURCH-MEN*, they having had frequently one and sometimes two *Church-Wardens* at a time.

3. The *Review* says, That when *Church-Men* were *Church-Wardens*, several *Irregularities* had been *Committed*, *Unnecessary Charges* brought upon the *Parish*, *Accounts* clandestinely past, the *Parish Church* *Damify'd*, and almost thrown down— And that it put the *Town* to 600 pounds *Charge* to *Build* it up again. The *Letter* says, That it *Appears* by the *Parish-Book*, that the *Accounts* have *Regularly* pass'd, after *Publick Notice* given in the *Church* for the *Parishioners* to *Attend*, except for the *Years* 1694, 1699. when *Mr. B—r* and *Mr. Gr—y* *Eminent DISSENTERS* were *Church-Wardens*, the former not having pass'd his *Accounts* till about two *Years* ago, and the *Later* never, he *Dying* greatly in *Debt* to the *Parish*. That the *Church* hath been kept in very good *Repair*, without any *Un-usual Charge*, except in the *Year* 1698, when by the *Negligence* or *Unskillfulness* of some *workmen* digging a *Pit* to fix a *Post* in for the *New Pulpit*, two *Pillars* fell down, with the *Arches* and *Windows* they supported; and yet the *Charge* of *Re-building* this, and *Erecting* the *New Pulpit* too, fell much short of 600 pounds, which the *Review* says it *Cost* the *Parish*, the whole *Disbursements* that *Year* amounting but to 457 l. 19 s. 1 d. $\frac{1}{2}$ which the *Parishioners* contentedly paid, except some *DISSENTERS*, who don't use to be *Pleas'd* with the *Adorning* and *Beautifying* of *Churches*.

4. The *Review* says, That an *Action* was brought against the *Minister* *Mr. Gale*, I suppose for *Presuming* to *Name* a *Church-Warden*. The *Letter* says, There was no *Action* brought against the *MINISTER*, neither is his *Right* of *Election* disallow'd, but *Allow'd* this very last *Election*, when the *Person* he *Nominated* was *Admitted* and *Sworn*.

Rehears. *Mr. Review* wou'd do well to tell us, whether in the *Sentence* of the *Court* in *Westminster-Hall* for the *Complainants* in this *Action*, the *Right* of the *Minister* to *Choose* one of the *Church-Wardens* was *Deny'd*. For there may be many *Points* in an *Action* of this *Nature*. And I know nothing of these *Proceedings* in *Westminster-Hall*. Was *Mr. Gale* present at the *Election* of these *Church-Wardens*? And did he *Then* *Name* his *Church-Warden*? And was this *Rejected* in *Westminster Hall*, upon the *Custom* of *Taunton*?

(8.) *Country m.* We shall nor have *Time* to go through the *Rest* of *Mr. Review's* *Accusations* to night. I must *Reserve* that for the next *Opportunity*. I will only say this now, That the *Letter* says his *Aspersing* of the *Clergy* and *Church-Men* at *Taunton* is most *False* and *Scandalous*, the *Persons* *Reflected* upon being of *Known Reputation* and *Esteem* in their *Country*. But this shews his *Bitter Malice* against the *Church* and *Church-Men*.

But we shall have more *Sport*, when we Come to his *Objection* of the *Ringing* of the *Bells* and the *Bonfires*.

ADVERTISEMENT.

ST. Paul no-mover of *Sedition*, or a *Brief Vindication* of that *Apostle*, from the *False* and *Disingenuous* Exposition of *Mr. Hoadly*, in a *Sermon* preach'd before the *Lord Mayor* on *Rom. xiii. v. 1.*

A *Collection* of *Papers*, concerning what hath been *Transacted* in the *Convocation*, summon'd *A. D. 1702* and dissolv'd 1705.